2.2.

and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3, is required to be reported and maintained with the CBA.

Respondent's address of record was and is: 3822 Albatross Street, Apartment 6, San Diego, California 92103.

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions Code section 124.
  - 5. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
  - (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.
- 6. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. AC-2013-23.
  - 7. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
  - (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.
- 8. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the CBA finds Respondent is in default. The CBA will take action without further hearing and, based on the relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this matter, as well as taking official notice of all the investigatory reports, exhibits and statements contained therein on file at the CBA's offices regarding the allegations contained in Accusation No. AC-2013-23, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. AC-2013-23, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.
- 9. Taking official notice of its own internal records, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 5107, it is hereby determined that the reasonable costs for Investigation and Enforcement is \$2,917.76 as of February 22, 2013.

## **DETERMINATION OF ISSUES**

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Erik Lloyd Tigard has subjected his Certified Public Accountant Certificate No. 85529 to discipline.
  - 2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 3. The CBA is authorized to revoke Respondent's Certified Public Accountant
  Certificate based upon violations of Business and Professions Code section 5100 (a) and section
  490 for criminal convictions that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions and
  duties of a licensed CPA as alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the evidence
  contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this case;
- a. On or about March 10, 2011, Respondent was convicted by a plea of guilty to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b), driving under the influence with a blood alcohol level in excess of .19;
- b. On or about April 30, 2012, Respondent was convicted by a plea of guilty to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b), driving under the influence with a blood alcohol level in excess of .08;
- c. On or about April 30, 2012, Respondent was convicted by a plea of guilty to a felony violation of Health & Safety Code section 11350 (a), unlawful possession of a controlled substance, to wit, cocaine.

| | ///

20 | ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21 | ///

22 | ///

23 | ///

24 | ///

25 | | ///

26 | ///

27 | ///

28 | ///

# **ORDER** IT IS SO ORDERED that Certified Public Accountant Certificate No. 85529, heretofore issued to Respondent Erik Lloyd Tigard, is revoked. Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute. This Decision shall become effective on It is so ORDERED 1 PARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 70691054.DOC DOJ Matter ID:SD2012704364 Attachment: Exhibit A: Accusation

Exhibit A

Accusation

1	Kamala D. Harris				
2	Attorney General of California JAMES M. LEDAKIS				
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General  DAVID E. HAUSFELD				
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 110639				
5	110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101				
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266				
7	Telephone: (619) 645-2025				
8	Facsimile: (619) 645-2061 Attorneys for Complainant				
j	BEFORE THE				
9	CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS				
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. AC-2013-23				
12					
13	3822 Albatross Street, Apartment 6				
14	San Diego, California 92103				
15	Certified Public Accountant Certificate No. CPA 85529				
16	Respondent.				
17					
18	Complainant alleges:				
19	PARTIES				
20	1. Patti Bowers (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as				
21	the Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs.				
22	<b>(†</b>				
23	to a social continua board of Accountancy issued Certified				
24	Public Accountant Certificate Number CPA 85529 to Erik Lloyd Tigard (Respondent). The				
	Certified Public Accountant Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the				
25	charges brought herein and will expire on June 30, 2013, unless renewed.				
26					
27					
28					

---.

3. This Accusation is brought before the California Board of Accountancy (CBA), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

4. Section 490 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that a board may suspend or revoke a license on the ground that the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued.

#### 5. Section 493 of the Code states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred, but only of that fact, and the board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question.

As used in this section, 'license' includes 'certificate,' 'permit,' 'authority,' and 'registration.'

6. Section 5109 of the Code provides that the expiration, cancellation, forfeiture or suspension of a license shall not deprive the CBA of jurisdiction to proceed with any investigation of or action or disciplinary proceeding against the licensee, or to render a decision suspending or revoking a license.

#### STATUTORY PROVISIONS

## 7. Section 5100 states, in pertinent part:

After notice and hearing the board may revoke, suspend, or refuse to renew any permit or certificate granted under Article 4 (commencing with Section 5070) and Article 5 (commencing with Section 5080), or may censure the holder of that permit or certificate for unprofessional conduct that includes, but is not limited to, one or any combination of the following causes:

(a) Conviction of any crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a certified public accountant or a public accountant.

#### 8. Section 5106 states:

2.3

A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this article. The record of the conviction shall be conclusive evidence thereof. The board may order the certificate or permit suspended or revoked, or may decline to issue a certificate or permit, when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made, suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under the provisions of Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing such person to withdraw his plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty or dismissing the accusation, information or indictment.

### REGULATORY PROVISIONS

9. Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations, section 99, states, in pertinent part:

For the purposes of denial, suspension, or revocation of a certificate or permit pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the Business and Professions Code, a crime or act shall be considered to be substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a certified public accountant or public accountant if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a certified public accountant or public accountant to perform the functions authorized by his or her certificate or permit in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare. Such crimes or acts shall include but not be limited to those involving the following:

- (a) Dishonesty, fraud, or breach of fiduciary responsibility of any kind;
- (d) Violation of any of the provisions of Chapter 1, Division III of the Business and Professions Code or willful violation of any rule or regulation of the board.

#### COST RECOVERY

10. Section 5107(a) of the Code states:

The executive officer of the board may request the administrative law judge, as part of the proposed decision in a disciplinary proceeding, to direct any holder of a permit or certificate found to have committed a violation or violations of this chapter to pay to the board all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees. The board shall not recover costs incurred at the administrative hearing.

## FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(March 10, 2011 Criminal Conviction for Driving Under the Influence on January 22, 2011)

11. Respondent has subjected his license to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct under Code sections 5100(a) and 490 in that he was convicted of a crime substantially related to

2.5

2.7

the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are as follows:

- 12. On or about January 22, 2011, Respondent was driving his vehicle while intoxicated. He was arrested and charged with two Vehicle Code violations: driving under the influence, and driving with a measurable blood alcohol in excess of .08 percent by weight.
- 13. On or about March 10, 2011, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Erik Lloyd Tigard* in San Diego County Superior Court, Case Number M126039, Respondent was convicted by a plea of guilty to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b), driving under the influence with a blood alcohol level in excess of .19.
- 14. In consideration of the guilty plea to violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b), the remaining charge was dismissed. The dismissed charge was for a violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (a), a misdemeanor, driving under the influence.
- 15. As part of his criminal sentencing following the guilty plea to a violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b), Respondent was placed on five years of summary probation; ordered to pay fees and fines; enroll in a first conviction alcohol program and enroll in a three day public service program.

# SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (April 30, 2012 Criminal Conviction for Driving under the Influence on November 23, 2011, with a Prior Conviction)

- 16. Respondent has subjected his license to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct under Code sections 5100(a) and 490 in that he was convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are as follows:
- 17. On or about November 23, 2011, Respondent was driving his vehicle while intoxicated. He was arrested and charged with two Vehicle Code violations: driving under the influence, and driving with a measurable blood alcohol in excess of .08 percent by weight and with enhancements on both charges for having a prior conviction for a violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b).

	18.	On or about April 30, 2012, in a criminal proceeding entitled People v.	Erik Lloj	yd
Tigar	d in S	San Diego County Superior Court, Case Number M142244, Respondent	was conv	icte
by a p	olea c	of guilty to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b), of	driving ur	nder
the in	fluer	ence with a blood alcohol level in excess of .08.		

- 19. In consideration of the guilty plea to violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b), the remaining charge was dismissed. The dismissed charge was for a violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (a), a misdemeanor, driving under the influence.
- 20. As part of his criminal sentencing following the guilty plea to a violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 (b), Respondent was placed on five years of summary probation; ordered to pay fees and fines; enroll in a multiple conviction alcohol program, enroll in a twenty day public service program and enroll in an eighty day volunteer work program.

# THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

# (April 30, 2012 Criminal Conviction for Possession of a Controlled Substance on February 10, 2012)

- 21. Respondent has subjected his license to disciplinary action for unprofessional conduct under Code sections 5100(a) and 490 in that he was convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee. The circumstances surrounding the conviction are as follows:
- 22. On or about February 10, 2012 Respondent was arrested for being in possession of a controlled substance.
- 23. On or about April 30, 2012, in a criminal proceeding entitled *People v. Erik Lloyd Tigard* in San Diego County Superior Court, Case Number CD239380, Respondent was convicted by a plea of guilty to a felony violation of Health & Safety Code section 11350 (a), unlawful possession of a controlled substance, to wit, cocaine.
- 24. In addition to the sentencing terms listed in paragraph 20, above, Respondent was required to enroll in and complete a Lasting Recovery drug treatment program within 18 months of his sentencing on April 30, 2012.

28 1 ///

2.3

2.6

### PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the California Board of Accountancy issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking or suspending or otherwise imposing discipline upon Certified Public Accountant Certificate Number CPA 85529, issued to Erik Lloyd Tigard;
- 2. Ordering Erik Lloyd Tigard to pay the California Board of Accountancy the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 5107;
  - 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: 1-17-2013 PATTE BULLL

Executive Officer

California Board of Accountancy Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California Complainant

SD2012704364 70646077.doc

L